REMARKS

Claims 1-31 are all the claims pending in the application. Claims 5, 6, 13, 14, 21, 22, 29, and 30 stand objected to only as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, and would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 5, 6, 13, 14, 21, 22, 29, and 30 have been rewritten in independent form to place them in condition for immediate allowance.

Claims 1-4, 7-12, 15-20, 23-28 and 31 stand rejected on prior art grounds. In addition, the drawings are objected to. Applicants respectfully traverse these objections/rejections based on the following discussion.

I. The Prior Art Rejections

Claims 1, 3, 4, 7-9, 11, 12, 15-17, 19, 20, 23-25, 27, 28, and 31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Microsoft Outlook 2000 SR-1 (hereinafter Microsoft). Claims 2, 10, 18 and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Microsoft as applied to claims 1, 9, 17, and 25 above, and further in view of Barnett et al. (6,369,840) hereinafter Barnett. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections based on the following discussion.

A. The Rejection Based on Microsoft

Independent claims 1, 9, 17, and 25 define that the "slot dynamically changes an appointment time of said descriptive entry depending upon real time location information relating to said descriptive entry" (apparatus) and "dynamically changing an appointment time of said descriptive entry depending upon real time location information relating to said descriptive entry"(method). This feature is not taught or suggested by Microsoft.

Conventional systems are somewhat cumbersome as there is no means to have the desktop automatically select appropriate icons to match a user's scheduled task(s). A better solution (the inventive solution) is to have the interface adapt to the user such that all of the resources needed to complete the task at hand are prominently displayed and easily accessible. As discussed in greater detail below, the invention overcomes conventional problems by changing the model used by the desktop metaphor from a static collection of manually placed icons, to one that dynamically changes the collection of icons and other resources to match the schedule of the user.

The inventive Calendar Desktop can dynamically adjust time periods to match external events. For instance, if a meeting is scheduled to start at 2 p.m., but the location of the other party is known and their estimated time of arrival is 2:10 p.m., the calendar could automatically reflect that by stretching the time period before the meeting so that it doesn't end until 2:10 p.m. The key to enabling this function is accurate information on the positions of participants scheduled to attend the meeting and estimates on their current speed and direction. Such information is available from commercial tracking devices such as the PinPoint from Airlink communication (http://www.airlink.com). This device combines a GPS receiver that provides Latitude and Longitude information with a wireless CDPD modem which provides connectivity to the Internet. It transmits a UDP packet that contains the location information to any IP address, port number combination on the Internet. The frequency with which it does this is configurable. In the future, position information will be available from mobile telephones. The U.S. Federal Communications Commission (FCC) has mandated that future mobile telephones be able to identify their physical position so that emergency 911 phone calls can be responded to with greater efficiency. By integrating physical position reports into the Calendar system, the invention can make predictions of the arrival times of users and adjust schedules to reflect reality.

These features are not taught or suggested anywhere in the prior art of record. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the prior art of record does not teach or suggest that the "slot dynamically changes an appointment time of said descriptive entry depending upon real time

location information relating to said descriptive entry" as defined by independent claims 1 and 9 or the process of "dynamically changing an appointment time of said descriptive entry depending upon real time location information relating to said descriptive entry" as defined by independent claim 17 and 25. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 9, 17, and 25 are patentable over the prior art of record. Further, dependent claims 3, 4, 7, 8, 11, 12, 15, 16, 19, 20, 23, 24, 27, 28, and 31 are similarly patentable, not only by virtue of their dependency from a patentable independent claim, but also by virtue of the additional features of the invention they define. In view the foregoing, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

B. The Rejection Based on Microsoft in view of Barnett et al.

As shown above, Microsoft does not teach or suggest the invention defined by independent claims 1, 9, 17, and 25. Barnett is referred to for disclosing a plurality of time slots and a plurality of links that appear on the schedule in the time slots. However, Barnett does not teach or suggest that the "slot dynamically changes an appointment time of said descriptive entry depending upon real time location information relating to said descriptive entry" as defined by independent claims 1 and 9 or the process of "dynamically changing an appointment time of said descriptive entry depending upon real time location information relating to said descriptive entry" as defined by independent claim 17 and 25, nor is Barnett referenced for teaching such features. Therefore, Applicants submit that the proposed combination of Microsoft and Barnett does not teach or suggest the invention defined by independent claims 1, 9, 17, and 25 and such claims are patentable. Further, dependent claims 2, 10, 18, and 26 are similarly patentable, that only by virtue of their dependency from a patentable independent claim, but also by virtue of the additional features of the invention they define. In view the foregoing, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

II. F rmal Matters and Conclusion

With respect to the objection to the drawings, Applicants direct the reader's attention to page 10, lines 5-15 which describes that the invention comprises a virtual desktop in which the user's terminal screen is viewed as a portal that can be positioned over a number of usually small, different desktops. This is shown in Figures 1 and 2 where Figure 2 is a representation of the smaller individual desktop which is part of the larger virtual desktop shown in Figure 1. Therefore, Applicants submit that the claimed link to a virtual desktop is shown in Figure 2 that links to the larger virtual desktop shown in Figure 1. In view of the foregoing, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the objection to the drawings.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that claims 1-31, all the claims presently pending in the application, are patentably distinct from the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to pass the above application to issue at the earliest possible time.

Should the Examiner find the application to be other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the local telephone number listed below to discuss any other changes deemed necessary.

Please charge any deficiencies and credit any overpayments to Attorney's Deposit Account Number 09-0441.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 5/12/04

Frederick W. Gibb, III
Reg. No. 37,629

McGinn & Gibb, P.L.L.C.
2568-A Riva Road
Suite 304
Annapolis, MD 21401
(301) 261-8071
Customer Number: 29154